AMENDMENTS

In the Specification

The following is a marked-up version of the specification with the language that is underlined ("___") being added and the language that contains strikethrough ("—") being deleted:

For the paragraph beginning on page 8, line 8:

Memory 304 can include any combination of volatile memory elements (*e.g.*, random access memory (RAM, such as DRAM, SRAM, *etc.*)) and/or nonvolatile memory elements (*e.g.*, ROM, hard drive, tape, CDROM, *etc.*). Moreover, memory ~~504~~ 304 can incorporate electronic, magnetic, optical, and/or other types of storage media. Note that memory 304 can have a distributed architecture, where various components are situated remote from one another, but can be accessed by processor 302.

For the paragraph beginning at page 19, line 20:

Reference will now be made FIG. 6, which depicts a block diagram of a representative SUT. As shown in FIG. 6, SUT 600 includes five components, *i.e.*, START, N2PB, PBIF, ~~BUF~~ BUFF, and CBOC. Each component exhibits pre-defined behavioral characteristics. In particular, each of the depicted components of SUT 600 is capable of counting received data, *e.g.*, data packets, and performing CRC checks. Additionally, it should be noted that several of the components perform differently with respect to each other when receiving bad data. More specifically, both N2PB and ~~BUF~~ BUFF propagate received bad data, and both START and PBIF do not propagate received bad data. Also, there are two different kinds of BUFF units. The "smart buff" counts good packets received, the "dumb buff" does not.

For the paragraph beginning on page 20, line 15:

Dataflow model 700 of FIG. 7 can be constructed based on the information presented regarding SUT 600 of FIG. 6. Note that the block diagram of FIG. 6 and the dataflow model 700 of FIG. 7 exhibit dataflow ambiguity. That is, each of the block diagram and the dataflow model 700 does not describe how data actually flows from PBIF to CBOC. In particular, it is ambiguous as to whether data arriving at PBIF first flows to ~~BUF~~ BUFF and back prior to being transferred to CBOC, or whether ~~BUF~~ BUFF is somehow bypassed. Because of this ambiguity, dataflow model 700, which provides direct analogues for the five components of the block diagram of FIG. 6, may be less useful than other dataflow models that do not incorporate such ambiguity. For instance, when information regarding the actual flow of data from PBIF to CBOC is acquired, an unambiguous dataflow model depicting the transfer of data through the SUT can be constructed. An embodiment of such a dataflow model will be described later with respect to FIG. 8.

For the paragraph beginning on page 22, line 10:

As shown in FIG. 8, dataflow model 800 includes vertices START, N2PB, PBIF1, ~~BUF~~ BUFF, PBIF2 and CBOC. Edges START→N2PB, N2PB→PBIF1, PBIF1→~~BUF~~ BUFF, ~~BUF~~ BUFF→PBIF2, and PBIF2→CBOC are defined by the vertices. Thus, component ~~IF~~ PBIF of FIG. 6 has been redefined for the purpose of dataflow model 800 as two distinct vertices, *i.e.*, PBIF1 and PBIF2, thereby removing the dataflow ambiguity.